

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36, 37 and 39-41 are amended. Claims 4, 16, 23, 31, and 35 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-15, 17-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36, 37, and 39-41 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be forwarded on to issuance.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Ortiz for participating in a teleconference with Applicant's representative, Richard Bucher, on December 14, 2009. During the teleconference, Examiner Ortiz made recommendations for amending the independent claims that Examiner Ortiz indicated would expedite this application being forwarded on to allowance.

Objection to Claims - Allowable Subject Matter

The Office objects to dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, 22-26, 28-31, 33-37 and 39-41 as being dependent on respective rejected base claims, but also notes that each of these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their respective base claims.

Applicant thanks the Office for acknowledging the allowable subject matter recited in these dependent claims. In this regard, to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended the pending independent claims in a manner consistent with Examiner Ortiz's recommendations. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection of these dependent claims be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 13, 20-21 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2001/0049685 to Carey

et al. (hereinafter "Carey") in view of U.S. Patent 6,088,524 to Levy et al. (hereinafter "Levy"), and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,517,658 to Gluss et al. (hereinafter "Gluss").

Response to §103 Rejection

In making out the rejection of claims 1, 13, 20, 21, and 32, the Office argues that Carey, Levy and Gluss teach all the claimed subject matter and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution, and without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 32 in a manner consistent with Examiner Ortiz's recommendations. Furthermore, claim 20 is allowable as depending from its respective allowable base claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this communication, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: Dec. 14, 2009

By: /rich bucher/57971 for P. W. Mitchell

Paul W. Mitchell, Reg. No.: 44,453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382